

REMARKS

Claims 1, 22 and 37 are amended. Claims 8, 34-36, 38-40, 44 and 157-161 are canceled. Claims 1-6, 9-30, 32, 33 and 37 are pending in the application. Claims 9, 10, 15-21, 23-29, 32 and 33 were previously withdrawn from consideration.

Independent claim 1 stands rejected as being obvious in one instance over U.S. Patent No. 5,882,419 to Sinha et al., and in another instance as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 7,024,105. Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that the projections respectively comprise a vertical outermost peripheral edge. Support for the same can be found in Applicant's application with respect to vertical outermost peripheral edge 54 as is shown in any of Figs. 4-7. Accordingly, no new matter is added. Claim 1 is also amended such that the subject matter of canceled claim 8 has been written into independent claim 1. Further, independent claim 1 is amended to recite that all of the radially inner sidewall of the projections aligns with and extends outwardly from the recess outer peripheral sidewall perpendicularly relative to the recess base and to the projection radially extending uppermost straight surface. For example in each of Applicant's Figs. 4-7, each of all of the respective radially inner sidewalls 50, 50a, 50b, and 50c align with and extend outwardly from recess outer peripheral sidewall 42 perpendicularly relative to the recess base to a projection radially extending uppermost straight surface 52, 52, 52b, and 52c, respectively. Accordingly, no new matter is added. Claim 1 is also amended to recite that radially extending uppermost straight surface 52 extends to an

uppermost elevation which is aligned with the vertically outermost peripheral edge. Such occurs in each of Applicant's Figs. 4-7 with respect to surfaces 52, 52, 52b, 52c, respectively, with respect to uppermost elevations 53, 53a, 53b, and 53c, respectively. Accordingly, no new matter is added, and Applicant's claim 1 as amended no longer reads upon Applicant's Fig. 8 embodiment with respect to an upper surface 52d and a radially inner sidewalls 50d.

Applicant's claim 1 as amended is neither shown nor suggested by Sinha et al., nor Fodor et al., nor any of the other references of record. Specifically, Fig. 6 of Sinha does not show all of a radially inner sidewall aligning with and extending outward from a recess outer peripheral sidewall perpendicularly relative to a recess base to a projection radially extending uppermost straight surface. Accordingly, such clearly in no way discloses or suggests connecting a radially inner sidewall with a radially extending uppermost straight surface that extends to an uppermost elevation which is aligned with a vertical outermost peripheral edge of the projections. In no way does surface 230 in Sinha et al. extend to an uppermost elevation which is aligned with a vertical outermost peripheral edge of the projection. Accordingly, Applicant's amended claim 1 recites something which is neither shown nor suggested in Sinha et al.

With respect to Fodor et al., at best such might be considered as somewhat analogous to Applicant's Fig. 8 embodiment upon which Applicant's independent claim 1 no longer reads. While Fodor et al. discloses that its projection comprises vertically outermost peripheral edges, in no way does such disclose or suggest having all of the radially inner sidewall align with and extend

outwardly from the recess outer peripheral sidewall perpendicularly relative to the recess base to a projection radially extending uppermost straight surface that extends to an uppermost elevation which is aligned with the vertical outermost peripheral edge of the projection.

Each of the other references of record is understood to be lacking in this regard. Accordingly, Applicant's amended claim 1 recites something which is neither shown nor suggested in the cited art, and the rejection thereover should be withdrawn. Action to that end is requested.

Applicant's dependent claims should be allowed as depending from allowable base claims, and for their own recited features which are neither shown nor suggested in the cited art. Action to that end is requested. Numerous claims have been canceled, and the withdrawn claims should now be brought back in as being dependent from allowable generic claims. Action to that end is requested.


Claim 1 also stands rejected under obviousness-type double patenting involving U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0180087. Applicant disagrees and requests reconsideration. The '087 publication is an application which claims priority to the instant application, and was filed the result of a restriction requirement first lodged in this application. As such is a divisional application filed the result of a restriction requirement in this application, it is respectfully asserted that obviousness-type double patenting rejection thereover is in error, and should be withdrawn. Action to that end is requested.

Applicant submitted an Information Disclosure Statement by Express Mail on August 16, 2006. The PTO-1449 of such has not been initialed and returned to the undersigned. A duplicate copy of this Information Disclosure filing is included herewith, as is yet another Information Disclosure Statement. Entry of each of the same is requested.

This application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8-21-07

By: 
Mark S. Matkin
Reg. No. 32,268